

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/776,173	02/12/2004	Tadashi Sawayama	03500.013470.1	3762
5514 7	590 06/15/2006		EXAMINER	
FITZPATRIC 30 ROCKEFE	CK CELLA HARPER	KACKAR, RAM N		
NEW YORK, NY 10112		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
·			1763	
			DATE MAILED: 06/15/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/776,173	SAWAYAMA ET AL.				
C	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Ram N. Kackar	1763				
The Period for Re	e MAILING DATE of this communication app ply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
WHICHEV - Extensions after SIX (6) - If NO period - Failure to re Any reply re	ENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY (ER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DOT IT IS A AVAILABLE OF THE MAILING THE MAILIN	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠ Res _i	consive to communication(s) filed on 03 A	pril 2006.					
· <u> </u>		action is non-final.					
3)☐ Sinc	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
close	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition o	f Claims						
4)⊠ Clair	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5,8,9,11 and 56</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)∐ Clair	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Clair	⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5,8-9, 11 and 56</u> is/are rejected.						
	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)∐ Clair	n(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Application P	apers						
9) <u></u> The s	specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)∐ The c	path or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)∏ Ackno a)∏ All	12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1.							
2.	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3.	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s)							
	eferences Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) 🔲 Notice of Dr	aftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	te				
information [] رد Paper No(s)	Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) /Mail Date	6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/776,173

Art Unit: 1763

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 11 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda et al (US 5819683).

Ikeda et al disclose a process of treatment of exhaust gas (Abstract), which contains unaffected gas, and by products from a vacuum processing apparatus for CVD or etch (Col 1 lines 10-20) by a trap, which contains heated filament (coil) in the path of the exhaust gas.

Ikeda et al further teach that the trap could be of any configuration provided it can produce heat such as tungsten (Col 8 lines 12-20). Further Ikeda et al disclose the trap to comprise a double wall structure for cooling purpose.

Regarding temperature it is noted that the temperature is specific to decomposition of a particular gas and deposition of stable by product film and is therefore result effective parameter and could be optimized.

Therefore optimizing the temperature of the filament to high temperature above 1400 for exhaust containing silicon would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention.

3. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda et al (US 5819683) in view of Pang et al (US 6194628).

Ikeda et al disclose a process of treatment of exhaust gas (Abstract), which contains unaffected gas, and by products from a vacuum processing apparatus for CVD or etch (Col 1 lines 10-20) by a trap, which contains heated filament (coil) in the path of the exhaust gas.

Ikeda et al do not disclose the vacuum processing apparatus to be a plasma CVD apparatus.

Since the process of exhaust gas treatment depends only upon the gas and not where it came from the disclosed process of Ikeda et al read on the claim.

However, Pang et al disclose treatment of exhaust gas from a vacuum processing apparatus for Plasma CVD (Abstract, Fig 2 and Fig 3).

Therefore using the exhaust gas treatment for an apparatus with plasma CVD would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention.

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda et al (US 5819683) in view of Shingo Murakami (US 4901668).

Ikeda et al disclose a process of treatment of exhaust gas (Abstract), which contains unaffected gas, and by products from a vacuum processing apparatus for CVD or etch (Col 1 lines 10-20) by a trap, which contains heated filament (coil) in the path of the exhaust gas.

Ikeda et al do not disclose the vacuum processing apparatus to be a photo CVD apparatus.

Since the process of exhaust gas treatment depends only upon the gas and not where it came from the disclosed process of Ikeda et al read on the claim.

However, Murakami discloses treatment of exhaust gas from a vacuum processing apparatus for photo CVD (Abstract and Fig 1).

Therefore using the exhaust gas treatment for an apparatus with photo CVD would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention.

Page 4

5. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda et al (US 5819683) in view of Yoshikazu Kikuchi (JP 63200820).

Ikeda et al disclose a process of treatment of exhaust gas (Abstract), which contains unaffected gas, and by products from a vacuum processing apparatus for CVD or etch (Col 1 lines 10-20) by a trap, which contains heated filament (coil) in the path of the exhaust gas.

Ikeda et al do not disclose the vacuum processing process to comprise silicon.

Yoshikazu Kikuchi discloses an exhaust treatment process treating silicon-containing gas to trap material like SiO2 (Abstract).

Therefore using the exhaust gas treatment for a silicon containing gas would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention.

6. Claims 1- 8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parry et al (US 4746500) in view of LePetitcorps (US 5571561).

Parry et al disclose a process of treatment of exhaust gas (Abstract), which contains unaffected gas, and by products from a vacuum processing apparatus (Abstract) by a trap, which contains heated filament (coil) in the path of the exhaust gas (Fig 1 and 2).

Parry et al do not disclose the filament to contain tungsten.

However tungsten has been known as a material of heating filaments for a long time.

LePetitcorps discloses a CVD apparatus where a filament containing tungsten is heated to deposit a material on the filament (Abstract and Fig 1).

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use tungsten in the filament of Parry et al in order to heat the filament for trapping action.

Regarding temperature it is noted that the temperature is specific to decomposition of a particular gas and is therefore result effective parameter and could be optimized. However in a certain case temperature above 1000 C is disclosed (Parry et al - Col 2 line 30-35).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 4/3/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the temperature of 1400 C is not disclosed. In response, as stated in the rejection, it is noted that the temperature is by product specific and it would be obvious to have this temperature for specific decomposition used in the invention.

Further applicant argues that references fail to teach generation of powdery by product.

This point is not persuasive since the claims do not recite this limitation.

Conclusion

8. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 1763

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ram N. Kackar whose telephone number is 571 272 1436. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 A.M to 5:P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on 571 272 1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kans_

Ram Kackar

Primary Examiner AU 1763

Application/Control Number: 10/776,173

Art Unit: 1763

Page 7